

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 70 are pending in the present application. By the foregoing amendment, Claim 50 has been amended. Accordingly, upon entry of this amendment, Claims 1 to 70 will continue to pend in this application.

This amendment is made to more clearly present the present invention. No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim. The amendment to the claims finds support in the specification and claims, as originally filed. Thus, no new matter has been added. Entry of this amendment to the claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicants' representative kindly thank Examiner Kelly for the courtesy of the interview conducted on October 28, 1999, regarding related co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 09/034,014 ("the '014 Application"). Subsequent to that interview, the Applicants amended the '014 Application claims in a manner which the Applicants respectfully submit places those claims in allowance. At the same time, the Applicants filed a continuation of the '014 Application ("014 Application Continuation"). Because the issues presented in the subject application are similar to the issues initially raised in '014 Application and discussed during the interview, the Applicants intend to await the response of the Examiner in the '014 Application Continuation and take into account such response in fashioning the continuing prosecution of the subject application.

In addition, the Applicants' representative kindly requests the courtesy of an Interview regarding the presented rejections before taking further action in this application.

The Rejection of Claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph:

The Examiner has rejected Claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regards as their invention. This rejection has been obviated by appropriate amendment and, where not obviated, is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants have amended Claim 50 so as to direct that claim to a method for preparing a switchable slanted transmission grating wherein the angle of incidence is not necessarily large. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Rejection of Claims 1 to 13, 16 to 21, 24 to 27, 29, 32 to 46, 49 to 56, 59 to 62, 64, 67 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 to 13, 16 to 21, 24 to 27, 29, 32 to 46, 49 to 56, 59 to 62, 64, 67 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,299, 289, issued to Omae et al. (hereinafter Omae). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The reference of Omae discloses a liquid crystal projection apparatus. As the Examiner has noted, this reference does not disclose a slanted transmission grating. In the absence of such a teaching, the Applicants respectfully submit that this reference would not suggest the invention of the present claims. The Applicants' representative respectfully requests an Interview to discuss the features that distinguish the present invention from the cited reference of Omae.

The Rejection of Claims 1 to 70 under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 to 70 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1 to 18 of U.S. Patent No. 5,942,157, issued to Sutherland et al. (hereinafter Sutherland). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' representative kindly thank Examiner Kelly for the courtesy of the interview conducted on October 28, 1999, regarding related co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 09/034,014 ("the '014 Application"). Subsequent to that interview, the Applicants amended the '014 Application claims in a manner which the Applicants respectfully submit places those claims in allowance. At the same time, the Applicants filed a continuation of the '014 Application ("014 Application Continuation"). Because the issues presented in the subject application are similar to the issues initially raised in '014 Application and discussed during the interview, the Applicants intend to await the response of the Examiner in the '014 Application Continuation and take into account such response in fashioning the continuing prosecution of the subject application.

The Applicants' representative respectfully requests an Interview to discuss the features that distinguish the present invention from the cited reference of Sutherland.

The Provisional Rejection of Claims 1 to 70 under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner has provisionally rejected Claims 1 to 70 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over all of the claims of

each of copending Application serial Nos. 09/033,514; 09/034,014; 09/429,645; and 09/033,512.

This provisional rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' representative kindly thank Examiner Kelly for the courtesy of the interview conducted on October 28, 1999, regarding related co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 09/034,014 ("the '014 Application"). Subsequent to that interview, the Applicants amended the '014 Application claims in a manner which the Applicants respectfully submit places those claims in allowance. At the same time, the Applicants filed a continuation of the '014 Application ("014 Application Continuation"). Because the issues presented in the subject application are similar to the issues initially raised in '014 Application and discussed during the interview, the Applicants intend to await the response of the Examiner in the '014 Application Continuation and take into account such response in fashioning the continuing prosecution of the subject application.

The Applicants' representative respectfully requests an Interview to discuss the features that distinguish the present invention from the cited provisional references.

The Provisional Rejection of Claims 1 to 16, 34 to 51, and 70 under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

The Examiner has provisionally rejected Claims 1 to 16, 34 to 51, and 70 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 27 and 35 to 44 of copending Application serial Nos. 08/814,625. This provisional rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' representative kindly thank Examiner Kelly for the courtesy of the interview conducted on October 28, 1999, regarding related co-pending U.S. Patent Application

Serial Number 09/034,014 ("the '014 Application"). Subsequent to that interview, the Applicants amended the '014 Application claims in a manner which the Applicants respectfully submit places those claims in allowance. At the same time, the Applicants filed a continuation of the '014 Application ("014 Application Continuation"). Because the issues presented in the subject application are similar to the issues initially raised in '014 Application and discussed during the interview, the Applicants intend to await the response of the Examiner in the '014 Application Continuation and take into account such response in fashioning the continuing prosecution of the subject application.

The Applicants' representative respectfully requests an Interview to discuss the features that distinguish the present invention from the cited provisional reference.

The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' representative below before taking any action in the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/20/00

By: 

Richard Peterson  
Registration No. 35,320  
George T. Marcou  
Registration No. 33,014

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
Suite 800  
700 13th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 508-5800 (phone)  
(202) 508-5858 (fax)